UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/521,772	01/11/2006	Ilkka Westman	59643.00576	1699

32294 7590 07/22/2008

SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY L.L.P.
8000 TOWERS CRESCENT DRIVE
14TH FLOOR
VIENNA, VA 22182-6212

EXAMINER	
BELL, LOUIS W	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2619	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/22/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/521,772	WESTMAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	LOUIS BELL	2619	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *13 June 2008*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-65* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-31,42,43 and 62-65* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *11,24 and 64* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *11 January 2006* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This is a Non-Final Office Action in response to the present US Application filed on 17 Feb. 2004 with claims 1-55, 58-63. Claims 58-63 has been renumber to 56-61. This case was restricted and applicant selected group 1: claims 1-31, 42-43. Applicant added new claims 62-65. Claims 1, 4 7, 10-11, 12-14, 22-25, 27-28, 42-43 are amended. Therefore, **claims 1-31, 42-43, 62-65** are presented for examination. The non-elected claims have been canceled.

Claims Objection

2. **Claim 11** objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim. Claim 11 depends on claim 1 and 10. See MPEP § 608.01(n).

Claim 24 objected to because of the following informalities: Lack of antecedent basis for "the network function" and "the service call session control function". It should be written as "a network function" and "a service call session control function". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim 64 objected to because claim 64 depends on claim 65. See MPEP § 608.01(n). The address information entity which claim 64 refers to is introduced in claim 63, thus claim 64 should depend on claim 63.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. **Claims 1-11, 22, 28-31, 43, 62, 65** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Pub. No.: US 2002/0147845 A1 to Sanchez-Herrero et al. "Sanchez"

As to **Claim 1** Sanchez discloses a method comprising: receiving a message at an Integrating Call Session Control Function *(I-SCSF receives an invite request S10, Fig.1, pg. 6 pgh 65)*; obtaining address information for a network function for which said message is intended *(I-SCSF receives address information, S30, Fig. 1 pg. 6 pgh 65);* and sending said message to said network function in accordance with said address information *(I-CSCF sends message to Server-3, S40, Fig. 1 pg. 6 pgh 65).*

As to **claim 2** Sanchez discloses the sending step comprises sending said message directly to the network function via a proxy or a gateway element *(the message is forwarded to the appropriate server, pg 4 pgh 36).*

As to **claim 3-4** Sanchez further discloses said obtaining step comprises querying a database and the database comprises a subscription location function *(I-CSCF query a SLF database, signal S20, Fig 1 pg. 6 pgh 65).*

As to **claim 5** Sanchez further discloses said database provides address information for said network function *(I-CSF receive information regarding where to send the INVITE message, 1 pg. 6 pgh 65).*

As to **claim 6** Sanchez further discloses said database provides information identifying a further database *(pg. 5 pgh 46)*

As to **claim 7** Sanchez further discloses said further database comprises one of a home subscriber server, a sser mobility server and a service and subscription repository *(pg. 5 pgh 46).*

As to **claim 8** Sanchez further discloses said further database contains said address information *(pgh 44-46).*

As to **claim 9** Sanchez further discloses said further database containing configuration information of said network function *(pgh 44-46).*

As to **claim 10** Sanchez further discloses determining if said message is for an Intemet Multimedia Services target or a non-Intemet Multimedia Services target *(pg. 3 pgh 32*

As to **claim 11** Sanchez further discloses receiving step, said obtaining step and sending step are implemented if said determination step determines that said message is for a non-Internet Multimedia Services target *(pg. 6 pgh 65)*

As to **claim 22** Sanchez discloses a method comprising: originating a message from a network function *(external client originate signal S10, Fig. 1);* determining an Interrogating Call Session Control Function to which said message is to be sent *(the external client sends a INVITE to a I-CSCF proxy, thus it determines the I-CSCF to*

send the message to pg. 2 pgh 65, Fig. 1); routing said message directly to said Interrogating Call Session Control Function if said Interrogating Call Session Control Function is in a same network as said network function *(pg. 6 pgh 65, Fig. 1).*

As to **claim 28** Sanchez discloses a method receiving a request from a first network function (*external client, Fig. 1)* an interrogating call session control function, I-CSCF *(external client sends signal S10 to I-CSCF, pg. 6 pgh 65, Fig. 1);* determining at the interrogating call session control function a second network function to which a message from said first network function is to be sent *(I-CSCF determines where to send the message, pgh 65)* ; and sending said message directly from the interrogating call session control function to said second network function *(I-CSCF forward the message to the intended receiver according to service information in FIG. 2, pgh 65, Fig. 1).*

As to **claim 29** Sanchez further discloses said network function comprises a network entity *(Fig. 2).*

As to **claim 30** Sanchez further discloses said network function comprises one of application server, server and gateway *(Fig. 2)*

As to **claim 31** Sanchez further discloses said network function provides adaptation functionality *(Fig. 2).*

As to **claim 43** Sanchez further discloses said network function comprises a server, said server *(device 26, Fig. 1)* being arranged to send a message for at least one user via a serving call session control function *(pg. 6 pgh 65)* and to send a

message for a least one user via an interrogating call session control function *(pg. 5 pgh 47).*

As to **claim 62** Sanchez discloses an interrogating call session control function comprising *(device 28 in Fig. 1 can be a interrogating call session control function, I-CSCF, pg. 6 pgh 65):* means for receiving a message *(device 28 receive message S-10, Fig. 1)*; means for obtaining address information for a network function for which said message is intended *(device 28 receive message S-30, Fig. 1)*; and means for sending said message to said network function in accordance with said address information *(device 28 send message S-40, Fig. 1, pg. 6 pgh 65).*

As to **claim 65** Sanchez discloses a computer program embodied on a computer readable medium, said computer program controlling a computer to perform a method comprising: receiving a message at an interrogating call session control function; obtaining address information for a network function for which said message is intended; and sending said message to said network function in accordance with said address information *(pg 6 pgh 65, Fig. 1).*

5. **Claims 24, 26, 27, 42** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Pub. No.: 2003/0108000 A1 to Chaney et al. “Chaney".

As to **claim 24** Chaney discloses a method comprising: receiving a request from the network function *(TER-B is a conference call server, pg 4, pgh 44)* at an interrogating call session control function, I-CSCF *(CSCF-1, device 93, receive SIP INVITE 104, pg. 4 pgh 44-50,Fig. 5)*; determining at the interrogating call session control

function the serving call session control function, S-CSCF, to which a message from said network function is to be sent *(I-CSCF, device 22, find S-CSCF, device 24, to which to sent the SIP INVITE by means of registering signals 41,42,43,44, 45, pg. 3 pgh 31, Fig. 2, it is implied that Terminal B and Terminal B conference server register in the same manner);* and sending said message to the determined serving call session control function, S-CSCF *(signal 51, Fig.2 or signal 106 Fig. 5).*

As to **claim 26** Chaney further discloses said determining step comprises querying a database *(Fig. 2).*

As to **claim 27** Chaney further discloses said determining step comprises querying a home subscriber server *(Fig. 2).*

As to **claim 42** Chaney discloses a method comprising receiving a message at an interrogating call session control function (I-CSCF, device 93, Fig. 5), from a network function *(TER-B is a conference call server, pg 4, pgh 44)* based on address information obtained by said network function *(conference call server receives information to call terminal C, pg 4 pgh 45, Fig. 5)*; obtaining address information at said interrogating call session control function for said message *(message 104, pg. 5 pgh 73, Fig. 5)*and sending said message from said interrogating call session control function in accordance with said address information (*message 105, pg. 5 pgh 73, Fig. 5)*

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. **Claim 23, 63-64** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over "Sanchez".

As to **claim 23** Sanchez discloses a method comprising: originating a message from a network function *(signal 10, Fig. 1)*; determining an Interrogating Call Session Control Function to which said message is to be sent *(external client sends SIP INVITE to I-CSCF, pg. 6 pgh 65)*;

Sanchez does not expressly discloses routing said message directly to said Interrogating Call Session Control Function if said Interrogating Call Session Control Function is in a trusted network.

Sanchez describes that external client send a message to the service requester node (I-CSCF) which is in a different domain; since the there are not changes made to the SIP INVITE message, the service request node or (I-CSCF) is in a trusted network (*Fig. 1, pg. 6 pgh 65).*

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art to receive SIP messages at a trusted network with motivations such as to furnish I-CSCF with the actual address or name of the HSS holding the data for a subscriber *(Sanchez pg.1 pgh 9).*

As to **claim 63** Sanchez discloses a interrogating call session control function *(device 28 in Fig. 1 can be a interrogating call session control function, I-CSCF, pg. 6*

pgh 65) configure to receive a message *(device 28 receive message S-10, Fig. 1);* to obtain address information or a network function for which said message is intended *(device 28 receive message S-30, Fig. 1, pg.4 pgh 35);* to transmit said message to said network function in accordance with said address information *(device 28 send message S-40, Fig. 1, pg. 6 pgh 65).*

Sanchez does not expressly disclose the I-CSCF comprising a receiver, an address information entity and a transmitter.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art to have an I-CSCF comprising a receiver, an address information entity and transmitter with motivation such as to perform the operations of receiving and transmitting messages as well as obtaining address information as disclosed by Sanchez.

As to **claim 64** Sanchez further discloses an interrogating call session control function wherein said address information entity is configured to query a database *(pg. 6 pgh 65).*

Sanchez does not expressly disclose the I-CSCF comprising an address information entity.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art to have an I-CSCF comprising an address information entity with motivation such as to perform the operations of obtaining address information from a database as disclosed by Sanchez.

7. **Claim 12, 14-21** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over "Sanchez" in view of Pub. No.: 2003/0108000 A1 to Chaney et al. "Chaney".

As to **claim 12** Sanchez discloses a method comprising: originating a message from an network function *(external client sends a SIP INVITE, S10, to I-SCSF proxy, pg. 6 pgh 65, Fig. 1)*; determining an address of a proxy entity to which said message is to be sent; routing said message to said proxy entity *(the I-CSCF receive the S10 message, thus the external client determines that it needs to send message S10 to the I-SCSF, device 28, Fig. 1);* routing said message from said proxy entity (the *I-CSCF determine form the message that it receives, S-30, the address or URL to where the message needs to be sent, pg. 6 pgh 65);*

Sanchez does not expressly disclose routing said message from said proxy entity to an entry point of a target network.

Chaney discloses a SIP INVITE message being routed to the entry point of the target network *(Fig. 2)*

Sanchez and Chaney are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor with respect to communications systems. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art to combine the teachings of Sanchez: quarrying a database to find network information and Chaney: forwarding a message to a device at the entry point of a network with motivations such as to setup a conference service *(pg. 1 pgh 9).*

As to **claim 14** Sanchez does not expressly discloses said entry point is in a different network as said network function

Chaney discloses a terminal-A and I-SCCF, device 22, are in different networks *(Fig. 2).*

Sanchez and Chaney are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor with respect to communications systems. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art to combine the teachings of Sanchez: quarrying a database to find network information and Chaney: forwarding a message to a device at the entry point of a network with motivations such as to setup a conference service *(pg. 1 pgh 9).*

As to **claim 15** Sanchez further discloses said originating step comprises originating one of a session and a transaction *(Fig. 1, pg. 4 pgh 65).*

As to **claim 16** Sanchez further discloses said determining step comprises querying one of a database, table, file and a list *(Fig. 1, pg. 4 pgh 65).*

As to **claim 17** Sanchez further discloses said determining step comprises determining the proxy entity from information contained in said network function *(Fig. 1, pg. 6 pgh 65).*

As to **claim 18-20** Sanchez further discloses determining the address of the proxy which will forward the message *(pg. 4 pgh 65).*

Sanchez implies that a proxy server such as an I-CSCF will route the message to the required entity based on the user identifier found in the UDS device *(Fig. 2 pgh 62-65);* but Sanchez does not expressly discloses that the device is an entry point.

Chaney discloses a SIP INVITE message being routed to the entry point of the target network *(Fig. 2)*

Sanchez and Chaney are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor with respect to communications systems. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art to combine the teachings of Sanchez: quarrying a database to find network information and Chaney: forwarding a message to a device at the entry point of a network with motivations such as to setup a conference service *(pg. 1 pgh 9).*

As to **claim 21** Sanchez further discloses determining step comprises accessing said database comprising a Domain Network System *(UDS translate user identifier such as URL or TEL into IP addresses, Fig. 2).*

8. **Claim 13** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over "Sanchez" in view of "Chaney" as applied to claim 12 above and further in view of Pub. No.: US 2003/0027595 A1 to Ejzak, "Ejzak"

As to **claim 13** Sanchez and Chaney does not expressly discloses said entry point is in the same network as said network function.

Ejezak discloses a device in one IMS system that communicate with a device in another IMS network *(pg. 6 pgh 88, Fig. 3).*

Sanchez, Chaney and Ejezak are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor with respect to communications systems. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art to combine the teachings of Sanchez: quarrying a database to find network information, Chaney: forwarding a message to a device at the entry point of a network and Ejzak:

communicating with devices in another network with motivations such as to provide enhance services to mobile units *(Ejzak pg. 1 pgh 13).*

9. **Claim 25** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over "Sanchez" in view of Pub. No.: US 2003/0041101 A1 to Hansche et al. "Hansche"

As to **claim 25** Sanchez does not expressly disclose said network function comprises a presence list server.

Hansche disclose a communication system that comprises a presence proxy *(pg. 1 pgh 23, Fig 2)*

Sanchez, and Hansche are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor with respect to communications systems. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art to combine the teachings of Sanchez: quarrying a database to find network information, and Hansche: Presence proxy with motivations such as to collect and transmit present information throughout a communication network *(Hansche, pg. 1 pgh 5).*

Conclusion

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LOUIS BELL whose telephone number is (571)270-3312. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nguyen Chau can be reached on 571-272-3126. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/LB/
/CHAU T. NGUYEN/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2619